AF CONTRACTING

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGY

MAY 96

VERSION 1.0

APPROVED:_____\\SIGNED_____

TIMOTHY P. MALISHENKO, Brig Gen, USAF
Deputy Assistant Secretary (Contracting)
Assistant Secretary (Acquisition)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The AF Contracting Information Technology Strategy is to establish an Air Force Secretariat-advocated and Major Command (MAJCOM)-managed information technology environment interoperable with standard DoD and AF common environments.

This strategy requires an aggressive transition from proprietary, hardware dependent, legacy applications and data bases to a client-server, standards-based environment. This transition will provide the flexibility needed to adapt to changing contracting policies and processes and emerging information technologies into the 21st Century. The strategy also requires an aggressive approach to achieving the data-based exchange of commonly defined information.

The basic assumption is that a common operating environment (COE) and standardized data will be available to support the future Air Force contracting information technology environment. Currently, these fundamental elements of the Air Force Contracting Information Technology Strategy are being developed as the Defense Information Infrastructure (DII), the Air Force Base Information Infrastructure (BII), and the DoD standard data repository efforts.

The Air Force Secretariat Contracting Systems Division (SAF/AQCI) will maintain version control of this plan. This plan will be annually reviewed and updated to reflect DoD contracting policy, business process changes, and the evolution of commercial and DoD information technologies.

The plan's goal, objectives, assumptions and tasks are presented in detail in the following pages.

GOAL

The goal of this strategy is to establish a standards-based, client-server Local Area Network (LAN)-based environment that fully leverages world-wide electronic commerce and electronic contracting business processes. The environment shall support Air Force contracting business processes and use emerging commercial information technologies and practices.

OBJECTIVES

1. Transition Air Force legacy contracting information systems to a Technical Architecture Framework for Information Management (TAFIM) compliant client-server environment.

2. Transition AF legacy contracting data bases to a data base fully compatible with the DoD standard procurement data model and DoD approved standard data dictionary.

3. Transition multiple AF contract writing systems to a single Air Force contract writing system which supports operational, central, weapon system, and research and development contracting business processes.

4. Fully document contracting application and data base interfaces with all functional areas that automatically input contracting requirements into current AF legacy contracting information systems, and accept output from these systems.

ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions are key to the success of this plan:

1. The Deputy Assistant Secretary (Contracting) staff will centrally advocate Air Force contracting information technology requirements, and programming and budgeting needs.

2. The Major Command (MAJCOM) Directors of Contracting will develop MAJCOM programming and budgeting inputs, and actively execute appropriate tasks leading to attainment of the objectives and goal of this plan.

3. The Defense Messaging System, the DoD Global Combat Support System (GCSS), the GCSS-AF, the Standard Procurement System (SPS), the Air Force Base Network Control Center (BNCC) concept, the Air Force Combat Information Transport System (CITS) infrastructure, and the Air Force Base Information Protection initiative will be available to operate with the Air Force contracting information technology environment.

4. Air Force contracting automated business process applications with associated data will physically reside at a local application and data base server(s). The local server(s) will be the first server(s) connecting to a procurement workstation and managed by the Air Force BNCC.

5. The local procurement data base will be the original source for the official contract file from requirement receipt through contract close-out.

6. Data replication for a DoD shared data base will occur at a server other than the local server.

7. The Future Year Defense Plan will support this plan.

TASKS

1. Establish a procurement workload analysis methodology and workload baseline by the end of 3QFY96. (SAF/AQCI, SAF/AQCO, ALMAJCOMs)

2. Update procurement analysis methodology and workload baseline semiannually. (SAF/AQCI, SAF/AQCO, and ALMAJCOMs)

3. Identify all contracting automation support resources and decide on an appropriate organizational structure by the end of 3QFY96. (SAF/AQC and AFMC/PK)

4. Establish an information technology asset inventory data base by the end of 3QFY96. (SAF/AQCI and ALMAJCOMs)

5. Realign Air Force contracting resources to support this plan by end of 3QFY96. (SAF/AQC and AFMC/PK)

6. Starting 3QFY96, convene a combined Air Force BCAS/MADES II Functional Requirements Group and the AFMC Computer Information Steering Working Group semiannually to review Air Force electronic commerce and contracting business opportunities; validate information technology requirements; and increase information technology leveraging awareness.
(SAF/AQCI, AFMC/PKS, and ALMAJCOMs)

7. Validate application and data base requirements by the end of 3QFY96.
(SAF/AQCI, AFMC/PKS, ALMAJCOMs, and SSG/SBEC)

8. Define just-in-time desktop Computer Based Training (CBT) requirements for electronic commerce and contracting policies (tailored to skill levels) by the end of 3QFY96.
(SAF/AQCI, SAF/AQCX, SAF/AQCO, ALMAJCOMs, and AETC)

9. Actively manage asset modernization starting the 3QFY96 so as to achieve a TAFIM, DII, and BII compliant information technology environment by the end of 4QFY97.
(SAF/AQCI and ALMAJCOMs)

10. Establish LAN, Internet, and World Wide Web (WWW) connectivity for every Air Force contracting person at each AF contracting location, world-wide, by the end of 4QFY97.
(SAF/AQC and ALMAJCOMs)

11. Transition Air Force legacy contracting automated information systems (AISs) and data bases to a client-server environment (Appendix A) capable of accepting the SPS by the end of 4QFY97. (AFMC/PKCO, SSG/SBEC, SAF/AQCI and ALMAJCOMs)

12. Define Air Force contracting interface requirements with at least accounting and finance, logistics and civil engineering functional areas, and the AF contracting report system, J001, by the end of 2QFY97. (AFMC/PKCO & SSG/SBEC)

13. Deploy just-in-time CBT capability to each Air Force contracting person at each AF contracting activity, world-wide, by the end of 4QFY97.
(SAF/AQCI, SAF/AQCX, SAF/AQCO, ALMAJCOMs and AETC)

14. Conduct contracting information protection reviews of Air Force Contracting AISs every two years beginning the end of 4QFY96.
(SAF/AQCI, SSG/SBEC, AFMC/PKCO and ALMAJCOMs)

15. Fully develop a plan to allow Air Force contracting AISs to accommodate the year 2000 date and calendar changes by the end of 4QFY96; the plan will be fully implemented by the end of 4QFY97. (SAF/AQCI, SSG/SBEC, AFMC/PKCO)

16. Provide modernization recommendations coordinated with DoD and AF/SC by the end of each of the 3QFYs to ALMAJCOMs. (SAF/AQCI)

17. Transition from dependence on Air Force contracting (i.e., 1102) application and data base system administrators to the BNCC support concept concurrent with the BNCC establishment. (ALMAJCOMs)

APPENDIX A
SPS TECHNICAL ENVIRONMENT

SPS REQUIREMENTS

1.0 TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

1.1 TARGET ARCHITECTURE

1.1.1 COMPATIBILITY: The Contractor shall ensure that his software is capable of operating within the minimum requirements of each of the SW environments described herein:

(A) a distributed common operating environment using a client-server architecture, in which various DoD activities will share computing resources and integration allowing remote users to access the system,

(B) a standalone, nondedicated environment (in which some platforms are DOS-Windows and others are POSIX-compliant), without network connectivity; in which the computer is either a portable laptop or notebook or a personal computer meeting the following minimum desktop configuration:

(i) 66 MHZ processor clock speed
(ii) 36 integer SPECmark
(iii) 16 floating point SPECmark
(iv) 16 MB RAM, expandable to 32 MB
(v) 1 GB hard drive,
(vi) two PCMCIA Type II slots, and
(vii) two parallel and two serial ports,

wherein the software applications and database are resident on the same platiform, are performed based on type of fictional user, and permit subsequent upload of actions and associated data

(C) an environment with PCs networked to POSIX-compliant minicomputer and platform servers including ‘ but not limited to: HP 9000, SunSparc Center 2000 with Solaris operating system, 486-based machines with UNIX variant IBM SP2, and server equipment procured under contracts with the Army (SBIS and JCALS contracts) and Navy (Super minicomputer and Navy Database Machine contracts),

(D) guidelines set forth in the Defense Information Infrastructure (DII) Common Operating Environment (COE) Integration and RunTime Specification (I&RTS) (Version 2.0) dated 23 October 1995,

(E) end-user interface with the Defense Information Systems Network and Defense Message Service (DMS) communications software and a DMS-compliant messaging function, and

(F) meet certification requirements for the Federal Acquisition Computer Network.

1.1.2 SOFTWARE INTERFACE: The SPS software shall be capable of:

(A) complying with the graphical user interface (GUI) manufacturer’s standard appropriate for the host operating system/environment

(B) concurrently performing and viewing multiple processes, applications and documents,

(C) allowing multiple users to concurrently view the original document or file, including while under edit,

(D) reporting discrepant data or results, and providing a mechanism for resolution,

(E) overriding system defaults, and

(F) allowing remote users to access the system.

1.1.3 RESPONSIBILITY FOR iNFRASTRUCTURE: The host military department or Defense agency will provide and maintain the SPS hardware and supporting environmental software within which SPS operates, including the platform operating system, network operating system, and modems. The Contractor shall be responsible for furnishing a relational database management system.

1.2 **EXTERNAL SOFTWARE INTERFACE REQUIREMENTS**

APPENDIX B
SAF/AQC MEMO, 18 APR 96
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MODERNIZATION

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON DC

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY

18 Apr 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR ALMAJCOM-FOA-DRU (CONTRACTING)

FROM: SAF/AQC
1060 Air Force Pentagon
Washington DC 20330-1060

SUBJECT: Information Technology Modernization

If we are to take full advantage of the Internet, World Wide Web (WWW) and other information technologies, we need time-phased modernization and fumding plans to upgrade our equipment. We need to ensure each of our contracting professionals have access to the Internet from their desktop environment. The " Internet is a key connection to our people, customers and contractors. Access to the WWW is critical to accomplishing and communicating our mission. We are making a concentrated effort to use the WWW for policy, FAR, DFARS, and AFFARS communication, as well as using the Internet to display draft and final RFPs through the AQC Home Page Business Opportunities section. Moreover, we are exploring combining the power of the WWW with the advantages of the International Merchant Purchase Authorization Card (IMPAC) and electronic cataloging.

We all recognize the many competing priorities at the MAJCOM and Wing levels for limited fiscal resources. However, a well-defined upgrade strategy for desktop hardware and communications "enablers" (e.g., LANs, modems, WWW browsers, etc.), clearly communicated to your LG and SC partners, will help marshal their support. You must aggressively communicate why upgraded desktop hardware, software, and Internet connectivity is essential to total acquisition lead times, required delivery dates, improved cross-fictional workflow management, ' and lower total cost of procurements. A strategy to upgrade one-third of your desktop hardware and communications "enablers" each year should be your goal.

We are taking an active Air Staff role in several areas.

a. We are advocating the collective Air Force contracting needs in support of the Standard Procurement System and working through the POM process to ensure Air Staff buy-in for this next-generation, DOD contracting program.

b. We are emphasizing the cross-functional synergism of future systems while working closely with our logistics, communications and information partners to improve the overall processes.

c. We will provide information to MAJCOMS on future automation technology/processes/equipment and examine the effect they will have on the way Air Force conducts its business processes in the coming decades.

Now you must take an equally active role.

a. As a first step, complete the baselining of your information technology capability. The recent information technology cap abilities survey you were requested to complete was intended to help establish the baseline for each contracting office's upgrade strategies, and provide a strong argument to strengthen your competitive position with other programming and budgeting requirements. I strongly suggest you complete this effort.

b. Next, develop both an upgrade and funding strategy that fully exploits Internet use and supports the Air Force's Base Information Infrastructure (BII) and the Defense Information Infrastructure (DII) common operating environments and programs.

c. Finally, build on the already strong partnerships with your communications, information and logistics professionals to allow you to fully leverage your contracting processes through the appropriate use of information technology.

Obviously, the challenge is ours to assure we have the connectivity and hardware necessary to operate in a streamlined environment that provides the Air Force with lean acquisition that is both effective and efficient. I solicit your support , in this endeavor. This is a coordinated AQC/SCM/SCT/SCX/LGS memo.

TIMOTHY P. MALISHENKO, Brig Gen, USAF
Deputy Assistant Secretary (Contracting)
Assistant Secretary (Acquisition)

APPENDIX C
SPS APPLICATION & DATA BASE STRATEGY

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

WASHINGTON DC

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY

15 Aug 95

MEMORANDUM FOR AQAC (CAPT Case)

FROM: SAF/AQCI
1060 Air Force Pentagon
Washington DC 20330-1060

SUBJECT: Standard Procurement System [SPS) Preparation Strategy

The Air Force contracting community is finalizing an automation plan that will prepare it for SPS. Our goal is achievement of a client/server distributed environment that allows the AF to be postured for SPS, yet still takes advantage of our investment in existing infrastructure and trained systems administrators. Our plan calls for the following technical environment to be achieved by the 3QFY97:

a. Our application and database distributed environment will require our buyer/contracting officer work station environment to have all of the SPS application and data resident at the local server to perform our contracting and office automation tasks. The official source of contract data (from requirements acceptance through all disbursements and contract close-out) will reside on the local server; we define the "local server" as the first server connecting to the AF desk-top. Data replication strategy will be implemented for official procurement shared data to reside at a remote server location.

b. A work station environment based on the minimum performance parameters stated in the21 Jul 95 SPS Draft RFP. Our contracting activities will be encouraged to replace work stations not meeting these minimum performance parameters with a minimum of a processor capable of a minimum of 90MHZ, 110 * SPECMARC, with a PCI local bus, off the AF Desktop IV-V Contracts or other . suitable contracts.

c. When hardware and software upgrades become necessary, our recommended client-server replacement will be a POSIX-compliant client-server solution to be acquired from the current Air Force "Information Technology" Contracts (e.g. ULANA II and Desktop IV-V). At the same time, we will make maximum use of existing infrastructure. Our contracting activities will be instructed that any client/server replacements must ensure a minimum C-2 security compliance.

Request you review and comment on the proposed technical environment. Please respond not later than 31 Aug 95.

Questions regarding this automation plan and recommended technical environment should be directed to Major Todd Klopp, SAF/AQCI, DSN 227-8472, e-mail; TODKLOP@AQPO.HQ.AF.MIL.

RICHARD P. HEFFNER, Colonel, USAF
Chief, Contracting Systems Division
Deputy Assistant Secretary (Contracting)
Assistant Secretary (Acquisition)

SAF/AQKC (Major Olmscheid)
AF/SCTA (Mr Ortiz)
AF/SCMI (Major Steffen)
AF/SCTT (Mr Cake)
SSG/SB
SSG/XONB
HQ AFMC/PKS (LtCol Beckman)
SSG/PK

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
THE DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT COMMAND
8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD, SUITE 2533
H. BELVOIR, VIRGINIA 22080-6221

IN REPLY REFER TO

AQAC

September & 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, (SAF/AQCI, Col Heffher)

Subject: Standard Procurement System (SPS) Preparation Strategy

My engineering and operations staffs have reviewed your Memorandum. The overall impression is that the Air Force has developed a superb technical strategy for the implementation of the SPS.

The Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) approved infrastructure architecture for SPS will also facilitate your plans for implementation of the SPS. The architecture is considered robust enough to permit processing at any level of the architecture. A representation of this architecture is attached. The following comments are submitted for your consideration:

a. When the shared data warehouse concept is fielded, it will be necessary for all Service and Component activities to access and update this database to ensure the reliability of the shared data warehouse. This will initially be accomplished strictly through EDI. The Corporate database will be replicated to another server to ensure data availability and accessibility. Current plans for the shared data warehouse call for it to be located at a Defense Metacenter (DMC) and can be accessed via connectivity through the Defense Information Systems Network (DISN). This will not interfere with your strategy to locate data at your "local server. "

b. The parameters identified for your proposed site platform environment meet or exceed current guidelines for fielding SPS at the local site.

c. Your strategy for software and hardware upgrades also meet or exceeds SPS requirements.

d. The Air Force might consider processing at a DMC in lieu of investing in Semetrical Multi-Processors (SMPs) at all local or regional sites, particularly when an AF Procurement site is collocated on the same base with a DMC. Using DMCS for processing may save the Air Force valuable information technology (IT) and operations dollars for use in other areas.

AQAC
Subject: Standard Procurement System (SPS) Preparation Strategy

Thank you for the opportunity to exchange information relating to IT strategy for the fielding of the SPS within the Air Force. Further questions regarding the technical environment for SPS can be referred to Mr. Steven Martin, Chief, Operations, 703-767-6345 or LTC Letroy McFadden, Lead Engineer, 703-767-6358.

E. J. CASE, CAPT, SC, USN
Director
Defense Procurement CIM System Center

APPENDIX D
DRAFT COMMENTS & DISPOSITION

AF Modernization Strategy
Comments/Disposition

The following written comments were received from the MAJCOMs as part of the Draft Modernization Strategy coordination on DRAFT Version 1.0, dated 15 Jan 96, herein referred to as the AF Contracting Information Technology Strategy. Comments are categorized by general topic area. An AQC disposition and, when necessary, appropriate language change follows each category of comments.

FUNDING

1. The basic assumption of a Common Operating Environment (COE) and standardized data is a huge leap. How are we going to get from where we are now to this condition? If it is available, at what cost? Where will we get the money to pay for this? (AFMC)

2. Having SAF/AQC "advocate" requirements and programming while having MAJCOM Directors of Contracting work the programming and budgeting increases the risk of failure. The solution is dependent on MAJCOM PKs getting the funding needed (in an era of shrinking budgets). MAJCOM PKs have to compete for funding along with every other functional. As long as the contracts get out the door and the work gets done (under the old system) it is unlikely PK data automation improvements will rank at the top of each MAJCOM's priority funding list. The funding for this must be obtained, the program managed, centrally. A top level AF commitment to EC/EDI, paperless contracting, acquisition reform, etc. must be backed up with funding and resources. Giving tasks to MAJCOMs without resources is a sure bet to fail or take forever to accomplish. (AFMC)

3. Budgeting and funding aspects are not addressed in this strategy. It should be clear to all parties (SAF/AQC, ALMAJCOMs, and Field Level Managers) who will be responsible for obtaining the funding for upgrades to hardware and networks, and when each party is expected to act. (AFMC)

4. Why not include the option of MAJCOM funding and deployment? Tell us what we need and we'll budget and fund for it. The total AF requirement is probably too big a bill to pay. (AMC)

6. Money is a big player in the automation strategy plan and we emphasize that funding should be provided by a higher level than MAJCOMs. (USAFE)

7. Agree with comments stated here. To make this automation Strategy plan work we will need a strong Advocate's role and centralized funding. (USAFE)

8. AF/SCTT agrees with those that applaud the effort but also wonder about the support/funding to make it all happen -- unfunded mandates have a notorious failure rate. Also, the schedule outlined in the original document seems optimistic. (AF/SCTT)

DISPOSITION:

The AQCI working definition of the Common Operating Environment (COE) is the minimum computer hardware and communications connectivity to support the deployment of the Standard Procurement System (SPS) as well as any interim rehosted AF databased contracting information system, allowed under the Director, Defense Procurement endorsed SPS interface agreement. The COE minimums are stated in the SPS solicitation technical requirements (Appendix A) and have been previously provided to all MAJCOMs. The achievement of the minimum COE is a shared responsibility between SAF/AQC and the MAJCOMs. AQC is centrally advocating (as part of the FY 98-03 programming and budgeting process)the upfront investment required to establish the Standard Procurement System (SPS) COE. The first available funding will not occur until FY 98. Thus, MAJCOMs must have their own modernization strategies consistent with achieving the COE, and must have matching funding strategies in place. Each MAJCOM has the information needed to plan, program, budget, and advocate to their LG and SC partners, their modernization path to establish the required COE. While awaiting FY 98 funding, each MAJCOM's modernization and funding actions must continue and be focused on the necessary actions to establish the minimum desktop, server, and LAN environment.

The use of standardized data will be accomplished by the AF contracting information systems (CIS) organizations responsible for transitioning multiple AF CIS and associated data bases to a single AF CIS and data base. No MAJCOM funding or actions are required to support this effort.

SYSTEM ADMINISTRATORS

9. Do not recommend transitioning our network support to the BNCC support concept by transferring 1102 slots. Support will falter and we will have to take more 1102s out of hide to get the mission done. If this concept is to maintain network only, that is fine. If it is to maintain the servers on the network, 1102 system administrators must be retained. If the 1102 system administrators must be transitioned, recommend including a plan for transition of our current 1102 system administrators to functional/IS interface managers. There may also be a need to review current operational contracting manning standards for adjustments. (AFMC)

10. Local people (on-site at the contracting offices) are needed to support contracting applications/personnel. Customer support will suffer if the contracting application support is transferred to the BNCC. (AIA)

11. If Base Network Control Center (BNCC) was the manager of our server, there would have to be some changes in the way that business is conducted by the Communications Squadron in support of our system. The system administrator has always been an internal process conducted by contracting personnel and the thought of turning that responsibility over to an external provider is a little uncomfortable. (11 Wg)

12. USAFE contracting community continue to emphasize the flight or branch chief should remain in the 1102 series with the possibility of a transition for procurement clerks to key computer administrative positions. The learning curve will be huge, and training must be provided. (USAFE)

DISPOSITION:

The future of dedicated AF contracting professionals as systems administrators will evolve as the AF BNCC concept, the SPS maintenance concept, and the transition of multiple AF contracting information systems (CIS) and data bases consistent with the SPS interface agreement and the AF Contracting Information Technology Strategy evolve. As these concepts evolve there are fundamental principles that SAF/AQCI will support to the AF/SCMI (Infrastructure Division), the SPS Program Office, and the AF

organizations responsible for the execution of the AF Contracting Information Technology Strategy.

First, AF dedicated contracting professionals will be the final authority for the accuracy and completeness of AF contracting applications, data bases, and data elements.

Second, AF contracting authorizations shall not be transferred to any BNCC - type organization.

Third, the support responsibility for the application and data base servers and the communications connectivity between these servers and AF contracting desktop workstations should be the responsibility of the BNCC, or another non-dedicated contracting activity (e.g., outsourcing).

While awaiting final AF, AQC, and SC decisions on the role, responsibilities, and structure of the BNCC, each MAJCOM should discuss these principles with cognizant MAJCOM SC counterparts and inform AQCI of MAJCOM views not later than 1 Aug 96. These MAJCOM views will become inputs to a consolidated AQC view to AF/SC. All MAJCOM views and the BNCC concept defined at the time will be presented at the Fall Operational Contracting Conference, Oct 96.

RESOURCES

1. The AF Contracting Automation Strategy has very ambitious goals and an aggressive schedule. Our capability to accomplish these goals will be wholly dependent on the availability of resources. Does SAF/AQCI intend to dedicate AQCI or Standard Systems Group resources to this effort? (AFMC)

DISPOSITION:

An AF contracting Single Manager supported by dedicated MAJCOM and Central Design Activity (SSG/MSG) people is fundamental to successfully achieve the goal, objectives, and tasks within the strategy's stated timeframes. This Single Manager concept, while not completely finalized, was briefed as a concept to all MAJCOM Directors during the Spring 96 Operational Contracting and Systems and Logistics Conferences. The finalization of this concept and communication to all MAJCOMs will be accomplished by Jun 96. The following principles will apply:

SAF/AQC through AQCI is responsible for AF-wide contracting information systems (CIS) and information technology policy, processes, CIS functional requirements, and budget advocacy for AF "corporate" requirements and funding (e.g., SPS COE).

SAF/AQCI is responsible for the development and coordination of the AF Information Technology Strategy consistent with the AF and DoD procurement information technology business strategy, the DII, and the BII.

SAF/AQCI is responsible for the establishment of an AF Contracting Corporate Requirements Definition Process. AQCI will chair the AF Corporate Requirements Board.

The AF Single Manger is responsible for the execution of the AF Information Technology Strategy consistent with established cost, schedule, and performance baselines. The AF Single Manager is directly responsible to SAF/AQC.

ASSET MANAGEMENT

1. Suggest changing "Actively manage asset modernization" to "Actively manage base-level LAN connectivity and PC modernization". Reason: Establishing the communications and PC configuration environment is a higher level function. Managing the assets and compliance with the environment should be a MAJCOM function. (38 EIW)

2. This is a massive effort [establishing and maintaining a data base of AF information technology assets] that may not be required or as a minimum, may be reduced in scope. Reason: rather than attempting to maintain a data base reflecting baseline conditions, suggest that the "operating environment" be defined. For PCs, a "Minimum Desktop System Configuration for DMS, GCCS, and DII" has been promulgated by ASD/C3I in the DoD PC Policy Implementation Plan FY 1995-2000, dated 7 April 1995. This will provide the baseline target (minimum configuration) that the system can be designed to operate. The alternative is to attempt to maintain current information on PC configurations that are constantly changing. Since the DoD configuration PC is mandatory, it includes PCMCIA cards, etc., that should be used in the system. In a similar manner TAFIM requires the use of GOSIP or TCP/IP communications protocols, so there already is a mandate to use them in DISN for the base-to-base communications portion of the system architecture. This reduces the communications problem to the on-base transport. Does a base have a IEEE 802.3 LAN in the building with contracting function? Is the building networked in a base-wide network? Does the base network have DISN access? (38 EIW)

3. (Task 4) This seems to be a huge effort with minimal benefits. Very labor & time intensive. (USAFE)

DISPOSITION:

A constantly accurate "baseline" of hardware, software, and available infrastructure is fundamental to bases, MAJCOMs', and SAF/AQC's ability to plan, program, budget and defend the technology refreshment, to meet the minimum SPS technical environment (Appendix A); this technical environment is also the basis for the AF Contracting Information Technology Strategy. Thus, establishment of an information technology asset data base, and active managment of assets -- by each MAJCOM -- is essential. Task 4 is a critical component of the overall Information Technology strategy.

INTERNET CONNECTIVITY

1. The schedule for Internet connectivity (4QFY97) is too slow. Does the "worldwide" scope impede the schedule or is the schedule for Internet connectivity hardware driven? (AFMC)

2. Agree that the target date should be moved up. Internet connectivity is a major factor which affects the effectiveness and efficiency of contracting personnel dealing with a myriad of customers. (AIA)

3. Internet connectivity is now available at most Air Force installations. Guidance from proper higher headquarters is all it would take in many locations. Provide that mandate. (USAFE)

DISPOSITION:

The 4QFY97 completion date for world-wide Internet connectivity is a Not Later Than Date. Part of Internet connectivity is the achievement of Local Area Network (LAN) and World Wide Web (WWW) connectivity from each AF contracting desktop workstation. The preliminary analysis of the recent AF information technology asset survey results (from about 3300 MAJCOM respondents) indicates achieving such connectivity will be an aggressive task.

The Task 10 language has been modified to ensure this task's scope for Internet, LAN, and WWW connectivity is clear.

To assist MAJCOMs' achievement of this task, SAF/AQC memo, 18 Apr 96, "Information Technology Modernization" (Appendix B) was distributed to all MAJCOM Contracting Directors during the Spring 96 Systems and Logistics Conference.

SINGLE CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM

1. This sounds good on paper, but may be impractical [the objectives of a single contract writing system, associated data base, and standard data elements]. Why do we want to overload a local client-server at base contracting with central, weapon system, and R&D contract writing capabilities? If you do this, base contracting will need to keep up with those extraneous data bases. The same argument holds with R&D, etc. Make contracting writing modular - at least the clause/provision data base. (AFMC/AIA)

2. [Objective 3, achieving a single contract writing system] Implies that the "single" contract prep system will be used for all aspects of contracts. That is fine as long as the software is modular and divided up into an operational portion, central and R&D portion so it can be used by the appropriate functions. This may not be a concern if the software size is manageable and the interface with the user is quick and easy to understand. (AMC)

3. Agree with the objectives and reiterate it should be compatible with the DoD standard procurement model. Also felt it is imperative to present a "SINGLE" DoD contract writing system. USAFE is investing heavily in both the DoD and AF concepts now. (USAFE)

DISPOSITION:

The single AF contract writing system will be based on the DoD standard procurement activity model. This model is the basis for the SPS. The procurement activity model contains all the business processes that a data based contracting information (and writing) system must be able to execute. The activity model defines "WHAT" the databased information (and contract writing system) system must be able to

automatically execute to support our procurement FAR and DFARS policies and processes.

The procurement business rules particular to R&D, weapons system, central, and operational contracting policies and processes are (arguably) executed through the automated clause logic associated with contracting writing. This clause logic will be modular to allow the flexibility necessary for AF contracting activities associated with one, or a combination of the cited business areas within the total breadth of AF contracting. The associated data bases and data elements will have similar modularity and flexibility.

CONTRACT FILE

1. [Assumption 5, "the local procurement data base will be the original source for the official contract file from requirements receipt through contract close-out] Implies that the "official contract file" will remain as the origination point. It was my understanding of the SPS CONOPS that the "shared data warehouse" would be the official file, once populated by the contract writer. (AFMC)

2. [Assumptions 5] It is critical the "Official contract file" remains at the originating point.

3. What is the value of making this assumption? [Assumption 6: Data replication for a DoD shared data base will occur at a server other than the local server.] (AFMC)

4. What is meant by "Physically reside at a local application"? The system server may well be located in LG or another part of the base. Data storage could be located in the contracting office if desired. (AMC)

DISPOSITION:

The AF contracting application and data base distribution strategy for SPS (Appendix C) requires all operational data constituting the official contract file and required for daily contract management to reside on a local server. The application containing the procurement processes and rules will also reside on a local server. A local server is defined as the first server connecting to an AF contracting desktop workstation.

For the purposes of shared data residing in a Shared Data Warehouse, data replication of appropriate operational data will occur, consistent with the SPS strategy.

The same application and data base distribution strategy will be followed in the execution of the AF Contracting Information Technology Strategy.

There is sufficient flexibility in the definition of a local server to accommodate any partnering between or among functional areas, e.g., contracting and logistics.

INTERFACES

1. (Ref: Task 12) Why will it take until the first quarter of FY97 to obtain these interfaces? The interfaces were defined during Procurement CIM modeling exercise for SPS. Interface matrices can be obtained from AFMC CO/PKB at WPAFB. Need to include an interface with J001. (AFMC)

2. (Task 12) Interfaces are critical, J001 should have a high priority for connectivity/interface. (USAFE)

DISPOSITION:

The task completion date is a not later than date. This is the completion date for all interfaces, both AFMC, and AF contracting information systems overall, to be completely documented, and placed under configuration control in terms of interface control document requirements.

The task associated with this interface documentation is expanded to specifically include the interfaces with the AF contract reporting system, J001.

The original completion date of 1QFY97 is adjusted to 2QFY97. The adjusted date better aligns with the evolving SPS need for AF interface requirements documents.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. Are all the above systems [Ref: Assumption 3, i.e., DMS, GCSS, SPS, BNCC, CITS] up and operational now? Do we have contingency plans in case SPS goes away? (AFMC)

DISPOSITION:

The systems referenced in assumption 3 are not fully operational. We do have a contingency plan in case SPS goes away. Under the terms of an agreement signed by the SPS Program Manager, and supported by the Director, Defense Procurement, we will be allowed to integrate and transition BCAS, a contract writing module, and an EDI module from a WANG-based environment to an open systems environment. This effort is being conducted to facilitate the documentation of interface requirements in a non-proprietary environment. This transition will be tested at one site in each MAJCOM, and the results of such AF testing will be evaluated side-by-side with the results of the testing of the SPS increment intended for deployment to WANG-based AF contracting locations. A similar agreement is being finalized for AFMC contracting information systems.

2. We assume that the projected dates are desired notional targets. If the purpose is to establish an initial, but dynamic, framework, then it is an excellent start. There are other areas that will need more detail, and possibly cost benefit analysis, as the technology environment is established. For example, the data base objectives and tasks. (SSG)

DISPOSITION:

This document is a living plan, subject to updates as the result of evolving strategies or technological changes in software and hardware. The cost and benefits of the data base objectives will be examined.

MISCELLANEOUS (cont'd)

3. Will this environment support all Air Force contracting business processes or just those driven from the top down? (AFMC)

DISPOSITION:

The technical environment as well as the application and data base will support all AF contracting business processes. To ensure this, MAJCOM representatives will validate application, data base, and technical requirements in accordance with Task 7 of the strategy plan. Moreover, the AF contracting Corporate Requirements Process with MAJCOM involvement will ensure changing business processes are supported.

4. Suggest changing [Exec Summary, Para 1] "with any DoD and AF common environment" to "with standard DoD and AF common environments". Although this is a nit pick, the overall strategy should be to establish a COE, not to attempt to develop a system that can work with "any" environment that may be in place. (38 EIW)

DISPOSITION:

Suggested change is incorporated.

5. Suggest [Ref: Assumption 3] deleting "-AF" after DMS. DMS is the DoD program. DMS-AF is the AF PMO dealing with implementation of DMS at AF locations. (38 EIW)

DISPOSITION:

Suggested change is incorporated.

MISCELLANEOUS (cont'd)

6. [Ref: Task 6, a combined AF BCAS/MADES II Functional Requirements Group and AFMC Computer Information Steering Working Group] Recommend including a statement that all parties will ensure dissemination of the most current status of the implementation of this strategy to our field level managers. Communication is important to obtaining buy-in when implementing this kind of organizational change. (AFMC)

DISPOSITION:

The SAF/AQC memo distributing the AF Contracting Information Technology Strategy to the field, makes a request for dedicated MAJCOM points of contact to ensure consistent and timely status updates in accordance with the strategy's tasks and timelines.

7. [Ref: Task 11, Transitioning AF legacy contracting AISs and data bases by the end of 4QFY97] Recommend reiterating what we are transitioning to a standard procurement system and a client server environment. (AFMC)

DISPOSITION:

Task 11 is changed to read " Transition Air Force legacy contracting automated information systems (AISs) and data bases to a client-server environment capable of accepting SPS by the end of 4QFY97."

8. These tasks [1, 3, and 4] are scheduled for completion by the end of 2QFY96. As coordination on the document has slipped, these completion dates must be reviewed and updated as, perhaps, should all task completion dates in the document. (AF/SCTT)

DISPOSITION:

Task 1 completion date is changed to 3QFY96; Task 3 completion date is changed to 3QFY96; Task 4 completion date is changed to 3QFY96.

MISCELLANEOUS (cont'd)

9. Based on our active involvement in EC/EDI, AF/SCTT would appreciate invitations to these groups [Ref: Task 6, combined functional requirements groups] for purposes of information sharing--in terms of both the subject overall (EC/EDI) and specific, current AF activities within that area of interest. (AF/SCTT)

DISPOSITION:

AF/SCTT will be invited to participate as a standing member of the AF contracting functional requirements process, to ensure better integration of technology insertion oportunities with procurement business opportunities.

10. I'm not sure what "data-based exchange of commonly defined information" means [Ref: Executive Summary]. Data standardization is highly desirable. (AMC)

DISPOSITION:

This refers to the use of standardized data. The objective of selecting such language was to place emphasis on the importance of data, vice just an automated document

generator; and, to place emphasis on the absolute need for common definition of data elements and thus the exchange of common information.

11. Reliance on the DII infrastructure seems to be a waste [Ref: Executive Summary]. The Internet and WWW should be our mode of transmission, not an unsuccessful DoD system. (AMC)

DISPOSITION:

We are committed to having our AF contracting information systems fully capable of integrating with the DII and AF BII. We must be careful not to equate the beginnings of the technical solution for EDI, and now FACNET, with the acknowledged need to better integrate the Internet and WWW into our business opportunities thinking and our future procurement information technology requirements.

MISCELLANEOUS (cont'd)

1. Overall the automation strategy is a good start. It is something we need to be following at all levels of the Air Force. (AMC)

DISPOSITION:

No action required.